



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,673	01/27/2004	Steven K. Ma	SVL920030110US1	3028

47069 7590 11/28/2008
KONRAD RAYNES & VICTOR, LLP
ATTN: IBM54
315 SOUTH BEVERLY DRIVE, SUITE 210
BEVERLY HILLS, CA 90212

EXAMINER

HANNE, SARA M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2179

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-------------------	---------------

11/28/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

krvuspto@ipmatters.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/766,673	Applicant(s) MA, STEVEN K.	
	Examiner SARA M. HANNE	Art Unit 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/23/08.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-4 and 6-10 are pending in the application. Claims 5 and 11-30 have been cancelled.

2. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114.

Applicant's submission filed on 10/23/08 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4 and 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moehrle, US Patent 7216301, and further in view of Rochford et al., US Patent 6633312, hereinafter Rochford.

5. As in Independent Claim 1, Moehrle teaches a method for rendering a display of at a first and second data sets in a search panel (Fig. 4A, ref. 102), wherein each data set is associated with one or more file components (Fig. 4B, 10b-10d); receiving selection the displayed first data set name in the search

Art Unit: 2179

panel (Col. 5, line 6) displaying names of the file components associated with the first selected data set in the search panel (Col. 5, lines 8-9); receiving selection of at least one of the displayed file component names associated with the selected first data set (Fig. 4B, Selection of ref. 50); rendering the selected data set name and the selected at least one selected file component name in a history panel (Fig. 4C), wherein the selected data set name and selected at least one file component are displayed in a hierarchical tree arrangement (Fig. 4B to 4C and corresponding text). It can be seen from the teachings of Moehrle that during the normal course of operation the user may initiate another search by returning to a previous level and repeating the steps of opening a second data set and selecting a second file component from the second data set and display a hierarchical history of browsing in the panel (ie. top line). However, Moehrle fails to explicitly teach rendering a history panel with the selected first and second data set names and selected file components associated with the selected first and second data set names are displayed together in a hierarchical arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and component file names of the selected data sets as recited in Claim 1. Rochford teaches a hierarchical file accessing system with history tracking similar to that of Moehrle. Rochford further teaches rendering a history panel with the selected first and second data set names and selected file components associated with the selected first and second data set names are displayed together in a hierarchical arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and component file names of the selected data sets (Fig. 8 and corresponding text).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Moehrle and Rochford before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the selection of a data set name and corresponding file component name for hierarchical display in a history panel taught by Moehrle to include the rendering a history panel simultaneously displaying the selected first and second data set names and associated selected file components of Rochford, in order to obtain selection of a first data set name and corresponding file component within the first data set, selection of a second data set name and corresponding file component within the second data set, rendering a history panel that displays the selected first and second data set names and selected file components associated with the selected first and second data set names together in a hierarchical arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and component file names of the selected data sets. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because an ongoing history tracker useful for multiple searches would have been obtained, as taught by Rochford.

As in Claim 2, Moehrle teaches the data set name is displayed as a parent at a higher hierarchical level (Fig. 4B, 10a) to the file components (Fig. 4B, 10b-10d) associated with the displayed data set name (Fig. 4B, 101), wherein the file components are rendered as children in the history panel of the data set with which they are associated ("menu item 1.0 is the parent of menu items 1.1, 1.2,

Art Unit: 2179

1.3 and 1.4", Col. 3, lines 22-23). Rochford further teaches rendering a history panel with the selected first and second data set names and selected file components associated with the selected first and second data set names are displayed together in a hierarchical arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and component file names of the selected data sets (Fig. 8 and corresponding text). Moehrle and Rochford have been combined for this reason as seen in the rejection of Claim 1.

As in Claim 3, Moehrle teaches receiving one search qualifier (Fig. 7C); transmitting a request for data set names that satisfy the received at least one search qualifier (1.2.3.x), wherein the displayed data set names comprise data set names returned in response to the transmitted request whose name satisfies the at least one search qualifier (Col. 8, lines 36-39).

As in Claim 4, Moehrle teaches transmitting a request for file component names of the selected data set name, wherein the displayed file component names comprise file component names returned in response to the transmitted request for file component names (Col. 9, lines 16-20).

As in Claim 8, Moehrle teaches receiving user action with respect to one selected data set name or file component name displayed in the history panel, wherein the action specifies an operation to perform with respect to the selected data set name or file component (when the user selects a level it creates a tab for that level as seen in Fig. 5D).

As in Claim 9, Moehrle teaches the operation is deleting the selected data set or file component (Fig. 5D, 5E deletes previously selected 1.2.3.4).

6. Claims 6-7 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moehrle, US Patent 7216301, Rochford et al., US Patent 6633312, hereinafter Rochford and further in view of Arkhipov et al., US Patent Application Publication 2005/0114769, hereinafter Arkhipov.

As in Claims 6, 16 and 26, Moehrle and Rochford teach files being accessed by a developer (user creating the active path) and steps of selection of a first data set name and corresponding file component within the first data set, selection of a second data set name and corresponding file component within the second data set, rendering a history panel that displays the selected first and second data set names and selected file components associated with the selected first and second data set names together in a hierarchical arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and component file names of the selected data sets (See Claim 1 rejected supra). While Moehrle and Rochford teach selection of a first data set name and corresponding file component within the first data set, selection of a second data set name and corresponding file component within the second data set, rendering a history panel that displays the selected first and second data set names and selected file components associated with the selected first and second data set names together in a hierarchical arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and component file names of the selected data sets, they fail to show the file components include source code as recited in the

Art Unit: 2179

claims. In the same field of the invention, Arkhipov teaches a file components including source code accessing program similar to that of Moehrle and Rochford. In addition, Arkhipov further teaches editing source code file being accessed by a developer (Pg. 1, Par 11 and Fig. 2, ref. 210, 220, 280). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Moehrle and Rochford and Arkhipov before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the selection of a first data set name and corresponding file component within the first data set, selection of a second data set name and corresponding file component within the second data set, rendering a history panel that displays the selected first and second data set names and selected file components associated with the selected first and second data set names together in a hierarchical arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and component file names of the selected data set taught by Moehrle and Rochford to include the file components to include source code of Arkhipov, in order to obtain selection of a two data set names and two corresponding file component names for hierarchical display in a history panel, the file components include source code files being accessed by a developer. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because an Integrated Development Environment for user's frequently used files would have been obtained, as taught by Arkhipov.

As in Claims 7, 17, and 27, Moehrle and Rochford teach the steps of selection of a first data set name and corresponding file component within the first data set, selection of a second data set name and corresponding file

Art Unit: 2179

component within the second data set, rendering a history panel that displays the selected first and second data set names and selected file components associated with the selected first and second data set names together in a hierarchical arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and component file names of the selected data sets (See Claim 1 rejected supra). While Moehrle and Rochford teaches selection of a first data set name and corresponding file component within the first data set, selection of a second data set name and corresponding file component within the second data set, rendering a history panel that displays the selected first and second data set names and selected file components associated with the selected first and second data set names together in a hierarchical arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and component file names of the selected data sets, they fail to show the source code files in different programming languages as recited in the claims. In the same field of the invention, Arkhipov teaches a file accessing program similar to that of Moehrle and Rochford. In addition, Arkhipov further teaches multilanguage documents of source code that can be accessed and edited (Pg. 3, Par. 38-39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, having the teachings of Moehrle and Rochford and Arkhipov before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the selection of two data set names and two corresponding file component names for hierarchical display in a history panel taught by Moehrle and Rochford to include the multilanguage documents of source code that can be accessed and edited of Arkhipov, in order to obtain selection of a two data set

Art Unit: 2179

names and two corresponding file component names for hierarchical display in a history panel the corresponding file components comprising source code documents of different languages. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because a unified interface for source code editing would have been obtained, as taught by Arkhipov.

As in Claims 10, 20 and 30, Moehrle and Rochford teach displaying content of the selected file component in a panel (Fig. 5D bottom panel) displayed with the history panel (top line) and the steps of selection of a first data set name and corresponding file component within the first data set, selection of a second data set name and corresponding file component within the second data set, rendering a history panel that displays the selected first and second data set names and selected file components associated with the selected first and second data set names together in a hierarchical arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and component file names of the selected data sets (See Claim 1 rejected *supra*). While Moehrle and Rochford teaches selection of two data set names and two corresponding file component names for hierarchical display in a history panel, displaying content of the selected file component in a panel displayed with the history panel and suggests an editing interface for the files (Fig. 6A) they fail to show the editing of the displayed content as recited in the claims. In the same field of the invention, Arkhipov teaches a file accessing program similar to that of Moehrle and Rochford. In addition, Arkhipov further teaches editing of the displayed content (Fig. 2, ref. 280). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2179

the art, having the teachings of Moehrle and Rochford and Arkhipov before him at the time the invention was made, to modify the selection of a first data set name and corresponding file component within the first data set, selection of a second data set name and corresponding file component within the second data set, rendering a history panel that displays the selected first and second data set names and selected file components associated with the selected first and second data set names together in a hierarchical arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and component file names of the selected data sets taught by Moehrle and Rochford to include the editing of the displayed content of Arkhipov, in order to obtain selection of two data set names and two corresponding file component names for simultaneous hierarchical tree display in a history panel, displaying content of the selected file component in a panel displayed with the history panel and editing of the displayed content. One would have been motivated to make such a combination because a unified editing interface would have been obtained, as taught by Arkhipov.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-4 and 6-10 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111(c) to consider these references fully when responding to this action. The documents cited therein teach similar history panels and source code editing displays.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SARA M. HANNE whose telephone number is (571)272-4135. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30am-4:00pm, off on alternating Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, WEILUN LO can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2179

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Sara M Hanne/
Examiner, Art Unit 2179